

E-01750A-09-0149

ORIGINAL



0000123117

From: Roger Chantel [mailto:rogerchantel@frontiernet.net]
Sent: Monday, February 14, 2011 7:14 AM
To: Admin Div - Mailbox
Subject: Help

February 12, 2011

Roger Chantel
10001 E. Hwy 66
Kingman, AZ 86401

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

FEB 15 2011

DOCKETED BY

Re: [REDACTED]

Arizona Corporation Commission
ATTN. Commissioners and
Ron Gould, Arizona Senator
Connie Walczak, ACC Investigator

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL

2011 FEB 15 A 9:35

RECEIVED

I would like to thank all of those that helped and for their brave involvement in trying to get an understanding of what is occurring in the above Docket No. I am writing you this letter because in researching the information that is on file with the ACC it is clear that Mohave Electric Cooperative's personnel has misrepresented the facts and has failed to follow rules, regulations and directives of the ACC. The first misrepresentation is that MEC claimed to the Commission that my art work or structure must be removed. NESC indicates that a building can exist under power lines as long as it meets a certain distance requirement. The only reason I can see why MEC misinformed you was to slander my name and maliciously cause me harm. If companies fail to give elected officials truthful and precise information in an investigation, it is the responsibility of the elected officials to reprimand the companies and its employees for providing inaccurate information. This Docket No. is simple in nature. It only becomes complex when MEC includes its elaborate scheme to make claims that a property owner is required to pay for line extensions around his property when MEC does not have a right of way to be on his property.

The complaint is that in 2006 I asked MEC to correct the unsafe line and pole conditions that existed on my property. MEC failed to respond to any suggestion to correct these unsafe line conditions. In 2008 I felt that I had to take personal actions to protect my family and belongings. I built an art work that is one of its kind in the State of Arizona. It was build with the assumption that this high voltage transmission line would fall some day. MEC claimed that this art work was a structure and violated National Electric Safety Codes. I offered a solution that would solve most of the problems. If MEC would bring this unsafe line up to the codes that are on filed with ACC by placing one pole in between the long span of 692 feet, this would correct their unsafe condition and it would put may art work in compliance with the NESC. MEC's plan was to force me into

giving them a right-of-way for their high voltage transmission lines or force me to pay for the moving of these high voltage transmission lines. MEC's claims that they have rights to my property, is what is being litigated in court.

My concern, as a citizen, is that MEC made false claims to ACC investigators. In an October 17, 2008 conversation between Connie Walczak of the ACC and Tom Longtin of MEC, Connie asked about the length requirement regarding the wire spans between pole to pole. Tom Longtin, stated "These lines have been here since 1949 and they met code at that time and still meet today's code or else he would have had these wires fixed to code." What is interesting is the new lines that were constructed now have extra poles that meet ACC and NESC's distance requirements. They are no longer 692 feet apart, but are approximately 350 feet or less apart. All MEC had to do in the first place was to add one pole were I asked MEC to put a pole to bring this old line up to code and eliminate the safety violation that MEC claimed did not exist.

In a letter dated October 21, 2008, MEC stated that the bill enclosed, in the amount of \$12,135.09, was due to them for costs to disconnect service to 10001 E. Hwy 66, Kingman, AZ and costs to relocate service to the railroad. **It should be noted** that the address of 10001 E. Hwy 66 is the address given by the County to my place of residence, which does not have a safety violation. The art work has an address of 9455 E. Hwy 66, as shown on the disconnect order, which was claimed to be in violation. My residence had nothing to do with the art work and did not have a disconnect order from Mohave County to disconnect 10001 E. Hwy 66. Mohave County clearly stated that MEC was to de-energize service closest to the building being constructed, which is 9455 E. Hwy 66.

The ACC investigators asked MEC to supply me with all of the information that would be needed to supply me electricity, because I have a medical condition that requires continuous electricity while sleeping. MEC's response in a letter dated October 21, 2008 states "Mohave Electric has verified that you are not and have never been on the customer medical/critical list which is maintained by our office." I responded by asking them to place me on this list and reinstate my electricity. I have never received a response to my request.

On October 30, 2008 the Commission received MEC's Service Rules and Regulations Sub-Section 111A, Non-permissible Reasons to Disconnect Service.

1. The Cooperative will not disconnect service for any of the reasons stated below:

- c) Nonpayment of a bill related to another class of service.
- e) The Cooperative will not terminate residential service where the customer has inability to pay and:

- 1) The customer can establish through medical documentation that, in the opinion of a licensed medical physician, termination would be especially dangerous to the health of the customer or to a permanent residence on the customer's premises, or
- 2) Life supporting equipment used in a home is dependent on electric service for operation.

Most of the other issues fall in the jurisdiction of the courts. The issue of reconnecting my electricity as I see it is in your jurisdiction. The National Electrical Safety Code Violation has been rectified and no longer exists. I, as well as many others, feel that elected officials have a duty to protect the laws. My request to have these unsafe poles and lines removed from my property falls within the Commission's jurisdiction.

I am asking you to reexamine these issues. If for some reason you feel that the ACC cannot issue an order to reconnect my electricity or you cannot request MEC to remove the unsafe lines and poles from my property, I am asking you to draft a letter stating that this is out of the ACC's jurisdiction. Everyone involved in this case needs to know if these issues fall within the ACC's jurisdiction or if the ACC wants them to fall within the Court's jurisdiction. I believe that my request is reasonable. Please send the original letter of response to my attorney of record and send a copy to me. Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Chantel
Union Carpenter/Visionary